



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/967,242	09/28/2001	Bertram Geck	2001 P 18013 US	6613
7590 Siemens Corporation Intellectual Property Department 186 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830				
			EXAMINER LEE, JOHN J	
			ART UNIT 2618	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/19/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/967,242

Applicant(s)

GECK ET AL.

Examiner

JOHN J. LEE

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9-16,19 and 21-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9-16,19 and 21-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-883)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-16, 19, and 21-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the limitation “base station rules” lines 7 in pages 2 should be changed to “the or said base station rules”, the limitation “said each wireless terminal” lines 8 should be changed to “said each wirelessly connected wireless terminal”, the limitation “the respective base station” lines 10 should be changed to “a respective base station”, the limitation “said communications” lines 12 in pages 2 should be changed to “communications”, and the limitation “the location of each” lines 13 should be changed to “location of each”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claim 9, the limitation “the event of” lines 7 in pages 3 should be changed to “event of”, the limitation “the restriction” lines 10 should be changed to “the look up base station rules governing restriction”, the limitation “the specific identify” lines 10 should be changed to “a specific identify”, the limitation “the at least one database to look up terminal rules governing restriction” lines 12 should be changed to “at least one database to look up terminal rules governing restriction”, the limitation “the wirelessly connected terminal” lines 12 should be changed to “an wirelessly connected

terminal”, the limitation “the allowance” lines 14 should be changed to “allowance”, the limitation “the restriction” lines 15 should be changed to “the look up base station rules governing restriction”, and the limitation “the restriction” lines 16 should be changed to “the database to look up terminal rules governing restriction”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claim 28, the limitation “by the base station” lines 7 in pages 5 should be changed to “by the base station rules database”, the limitation “the specific identity of the communication originating device” lines 7 should be changed to “a specific identity of a communication originating device”, the limitation “the communication destination device” lines 8 should be changed to “a communication destination device”, the limitation “the location of each” lines 5 in pages 6 should be changed to “location of each”, and the limitation “the respective ones” lines 6 in pages 6 should be changed to “the respective ones of the plurality of base stations”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claim 29, the limitation “of base station rules” lines 7 in pages 6 should be changed to “of the base station rules”, the limitation “the restriction on the features” lines 9 should be changed to “restriction on the features”, the limitation “the location of each” lines 13 in pages 6 should be changed to “location of each”, the limitation “the respective base station” lines 15 in pages 6 should be changed to “a respective base station”, and the limitation “the respective ones” lines 15 in pages 6 should be changed to “the respective base stations”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claim 30, the limitation “the incoming emergency communication” lines 7 in pages 7 should be changed to “incoming emergency communication”, and the limitation “the at least one database to look up terminal rules governing restriction on the wirelessly connected terminal” lines 11 in pages 7 should be changed to “at least one database to look up terminal rules governing restriction on the wirelessly connected terminal”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claim 31, the limitation “the at least one database to look up terminal rules governing restriction on the wirelessly connected terminal” lines 7 in pages 7 should be changed to “at least one database to look up terminal rules governing restriction on the wirelessly connected terminal”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bonta et al. (US 6,097,953) discloses Method of Performing Handoff in a Wireless Communication System.

Ranta (US 6,832,093) discloses Restricting the Operation of a Radio Device Within a Certain Area.

Aoki et al. (US 2004/0121769) discloses Mobile Radio Communication System and Method of Registering Position Therein.

Information regarding...Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system...
at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)."

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231
Or P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313

or faxed (571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: (703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to USPTO Headquarters,
Alexandria, VA.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to **John J. Lee** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7880**.
He can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays from 8:30am-5:00
pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Nay
Maung**, can be reached on **(571) 272-7882**. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to
the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone
number is (703) 305-4700.

J.L
June 17, 2008
John J. Lee

/JOHN J LEE/
Examiner, Art Unit 2618

